

REMARKS

The Office Action rejected claims 39, 42, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 5,872,909 issued to Wilner et al. (“Wilner”) in view of United States Patent 7,243,271 issued to Teegan et al. (“Teegan”). The Office Action also rejected claims 1-4, 19, 20, 30, 32-36, 40, 41, 43, 46, 47, 49, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of United States Patent Publication Number 2002/0083217 by Ward et al. (“Ward”). The Office Action also rejected claims 10, 12-14, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of United States Patent 6,742,143 issued to Kaler et al. (“Kaler”). The Office Action also rejected claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Kaler in further view of United States Patent 6,611,498 issued to Baker et al. (“Baker”). The Office Action also rejected claims 5-9, 31, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Ward in further view of Kaler. The Office Action also rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Kaler in further view of Ward. The Office Action also rejected claims 23-27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Baker. The Office Action also rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Baker in further view of Kaler. The Office Action also rejected claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Ward in further view of Baker.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3-7, 9-20, 23-34, and 36-45. Applicants have not canceled any claims. Applicants have not added any new claims. Applicants do not surrender any equivalents to any amended limitation or elements of any claim. Accordingly,

claims 1-20 and 23-50 will be pending after entry of this Amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-9

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Ward. The Office Action also rejected claims 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Ward in further view of Kaler. Claims 2-9 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a method of logging events for several applications that operate on an operating system of a first computer. The method receives a request from a particular application of the applications to create an event object associated with an event of the application that has not been logged. The method, in response to the request, creates the event object in a first memory space that is separate from a second memory space in which the application operates. The method receives temporal data and other data regarding the event from the application. The method stores the received data regarding the event in the event object. The method processes the stored data regarding the event in order to produce processed event data for display on a web browser of a second computer that is connected to the first computer through the Internet. The receiving the request, creating, receiving the data, storing, and processing are performed by an event logging mechanism that is part of the operating system and operates independently from the application on the first computer on which the application operates.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 1 unpatentable for at least the following reasons. For instance, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose (1) receiving a request from an application to create an event object associated with an event of the application, (2) creating the event object in a first memory space that is separate from a second memory space in which the application operates, (3) receiving temporal data and other data

regarding the event from the application, (4) storing the received data regarding the event in the event object, and (5) processing the stored data regarding the event in order to produce processed event data for display on a web browser. Also, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose an event logging mechanism that performs the receiving the request, creating, receiving the data, storing, and processing, as recited in the claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 1 unpatentable. As claims 2-9 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-9 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 1-9.

II. Rejection of Claims 10-18

The Office Action rejected claims 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Kaler. The Office Action also rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Kaler in further view of Ward. The Office Action also rejected claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Kaler in further view of Baker. Claims 11-18 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 10.

Claim 10 recites a first computer that includes computer readable storage. The computer readable medium is for storing an operating system that includes an event logger. The computer readable medium is for storing several applications that operates on the operating system. The event logger operates independently of the applications. The event logger is for receiving input through a web browser of a second computer to enable event logging. The second computer is connected to the first computer through the Internet. When the event logging is enabled, the event logger (i) identifies a set of events for a particular application in the several applications operating on the operating

system, (ii) generates an event log, and (iii) records event data regarding the identified set of events in the event log, the event log generated and the event data recorded in the event log without referencing any event logs of the application. The event logging mechanism performs the receiving, identifying, generating, and recording on the first computer on which the particular application operates.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 10 unpatentable for at least the following reasons. For instance, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose an event logger for receiving input through a web browser of a computer to enable event logging. Also, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose an event logging mechanism that when event logging is enabled, (1) identifies a set of events for a particular application, (2) generates an event log, and (3) records event data regarding the identified set of events in the event log.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 10 unpatentable. As claims 11-18 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-18 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 10. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 10-18.

III. Rejection of Claims 19 and 20

The Office Action rejected claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Ward. Claim 20 is dependent directly on claim 19.

Claim 19 recites an article that includes a computer readable medium storing a computer program for execution by at least one processor. For each event of several events relating to an application that generates web pages and responds to selections received through the generated web pages and that operates on an operating system of a computer, the computer program receives event

data related to at least one of a request for a web page, generation of a web page, and a request received through a selection of an item of the generated web page, and records the event data information regarding the event. The receiving and recording are performed by an event logging mechanism that is part of the operating system of the computer and that runs independently from the application on the computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render the article of claim 19 unpatentable for at least the following reasons. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose or suggest an application (i) that generates web pages and responds to selections received through said generated web pages and (ii) that operates on an operating system of a computer, and an event logging mechanism (i) that is part of an operating system of a computer and (ii) that is runs independently from the application on the computer on which the application executes.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references does not render claim 19 unpatentable. As claims 20 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 19, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 19. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 19-20.

IV. Rejection of Claims 23-29

The Office Action rejected claims 23-27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Baker. The Office Action also rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Baker in further view of Kaler. Claims 24-29 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 23.

Claim 23 recites a computer that includes computer readable storage for storing an operating system that includes an event logger. The computer readable storage also stores several applications for operating on the operating system. The event logger records event data for each of several events of several applications in a first memory space that is uniquely allocated for the event logger and is separate from a second memory space allocated for the several applications. The event logger groups several of the event data into several hierarchical sets of events. Each hierarchical set includes a parent event and at least one child event. The event logger, for several of the hierarchical sets of events, defines a nested hierarchical display of event data that displays the parent events at one aligned level in the hierarchy and displays the child events at another aligned level in the hierarchy under the corresponding parent events.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render the computer of claim 23 unpatentable for at least the following reasons. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose or suggest an event logger that (i) groups several event data into several hierarchical sets of events, where each hierarchical set includes a parent event and at least one child event and (ii), for several of the hierarchical sets of events, defines a nested hierarchical display of event data that displays the parent events at one aligned level in the hierarchy and displays the child events at another aligned level in the hierarchy under the corresponding parent events.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references does not render claim 23 unpatentable. As claims 24-29 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 23, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24-29 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 23. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 23-29.

V. Rejection of Claims 30-38

The Office Action rejected claims 30, 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Ward. The Office Action also rejected claims 31, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Ward in further view of Kaler. Claims 31-38 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 30.

Claim 30 recites an event logging method. For each of several events that need to be logged within several applications operating on an operating system of a computer, the method records event data for each of several application events in a first memory space that is uniquely allocated for the event logging method. The first memory space is separate from a second memory space allocated for the several applications. For each application in the several applications, the method groups several of the event data into several hierarchical sets of events. Each hierarchical set includes a parent event and at least one child event. For several of the hierarchical sets of events, the method defines a nested hierarchical display of event data that displays the parent events at one aligned level in the hierarchy and displays the child events at another aligned level in the hierarchy under the corresponding parent events. The recording, grouping, and defining are performed by an event logging mechanism that is part of the operating system of the computer and that runs independently from the applications on a the computer.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render the method of claim 30 unpatentable for at least the following reasons. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose or suggest a method that (i) groups several event data into several hierarchical sets of events, where each hierarchical set includes a parent event and at least one child event and (ii) defines a nested hierarchical display of event data that displays the parent events at one aligned level in the hierarchy and displays the child events at another aligned level in the hierarchy under the corresponding parent events.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references does not render claim 30 unpatentable. As claims 31-38 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 30, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 31-38 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 30. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 30-38.

VI. Rejection of Claims 39-41

The Office Action rejected claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan. The Office Action also rejected claims 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Ward. Claims 40-41 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 39.

Claim 39 recites a method of logging events for an application. The method receives a set of events generated by the application. The method also creates a corresponding set of event data in a first memory space that is separate from a second memory space in which the application executes. The method analyzes the set of event data by determining a procedural level at which each event is executed in the application. The method further hierarchically groups the set of event data into several groups based on the analysis of the set of event data. Each event executed at a same procedural level in the application is grouped in a same group. The method defines a hierarchical display of event data that includes a nested hierarchical presentation of data for each of the events based on the grouping. The hierarchical display is presented in a web browser. The receiving, creating, analyzing grouping, and generating are performed by an event logging mechanism running independently from the application on a single computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render the method of claim 39 unpatentable for at least the following reasons. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose or suggest a method that (i) groups a set of event data into several

groups based on an analysis of the set of event data and (ii) defines a nested hierarchical display of event data that displays a parent events at one aligned level in the hierarchy and displays a child events at another aligned level in the hierarchy under the corresponding parent events.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references does not render claim 39 unpatentable. As claims 40-41 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 40-41 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 39. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 39-41.

VII. Rejection of Claims 42-45

The Office Action rejected claims 42 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan. The Office Action also rejected claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Ward. The Office Action also rejected claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Kaler. Claims 43-45 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 42.

Claim 42 recites a computer that includes a computer readable storage. The computer readable medium is for storing an operating system that includes an event logger. The computer readable medium is for storing several applications operating on the operating system. At least one particular application is for generating web pages and responding to web page selections received through the generated web pages. The event logger is for functioning interoperably with but separately from the applications, and identifying several event data for several application events of the particular application. The application events include a request for a web page, generation of a web page, and a request received through a selection of an item of the generated web page. The event logger is further for storing the event data in an application event log.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 42 unpatentable for at least the following reasons. For instance, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose an event logger for (1) functioning interoperably with but separately from applications and (2) identifying a several event data for several application events of a particular application. Also, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose such application event that include a request for a web page, generation of a web page, and a request received through a selection of an item of the generated web page.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 42 unpatentable. As claims 43-45 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 42, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 43-45 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 42. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 42-45.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 46-50

The Office Action rejected claims 46, 47, 49, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Ward. The Office Action also rejected claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilner in view of Teegan in further view of Ward in further view of Baker. Claims 47-50 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 46.

Claim 46 recites a method. The method identifies a set of events that has not been logged by an application. The method analyzes the set of events identified for the application. Each event includes at least a start time and an end time. The method groups the set of events based on the analysis of the set of events. The method generates a display of the set of events based on the grouping. The identifying, analyzing, grouping, and generating are performed by an event analysis

mechanism running on a single computer on which the application runs. The event analysis mechanism runs independently from the application on the computer.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 46 unpatentable for at least the following reasons. For instance, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose (1) analyzing the set of events identified for the application, (2) grouping the set of events based on the analysis of the set of events, and (3) generating a display of the set of events based on the grouping. Also, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose an event analysis mechanism that performs the identifying, analyzing, grouping, and generating, as recited in the claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 46 unpatentable. As claims 47-50 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 46, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 47-50 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 46. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 46-50.

IX. Statement Regarding Amendments

Applicants do not surrender any equivalents to any amended limitation or elements of any claim. In reviewing the claims that are submitted with this Amendment, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner review each particular claim in this application on its own without reference to past or future amendments to and arguments in support of unrelated claims in this application. For a particular claim, unrelated claims are claims that are not in the same claim set as the particular claim. A claim set includes only the claims that depend directly or indirectly from one independent claim as well as the independent claim itself. Moreover, in reviewing the claims that are submitted with this Amendment, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner review each particular claim in this application on its own without reference to past or future claim amendments

and arguments in any application related to this application. Furthermore, in reviewing any amended claim that was previously amended, Applicants request that the Examiner disregard prior amendments to the claim that have been removed in this Amendment or substantially modified in this amendment so as to effectively remove these prior amendments.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims, namely claims 1-20 and 23-50, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Applicants have submitted all known required fees and petitions. Accordingly, Applicants believe that no additional fees, petitions for extensions of time, other petitions, and/or other forms of relief are required for the submission of this Amendment and Response. However, in the unlikely event that the Commissioner determines that additional fees, petitions for extensions of time, other petitions, and/or other forms of relief are required, Applicants hereby make such petitions as are required, request such extensions of time and other forms of relief as are required, and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions for extensions of time, other petitions, and/or other forms of relief to **Deposit Account No. 50-3804** referencing **APLE.P0005**.

Respectfully Submitted,

December 9, 2009

Date

/Lam Doan/

Lam Doan

Reg. No. 63,593

Adeli & Tollen LLP
11940 San Vicente Blvd.Suite 100
Los Angeles, CA 90049
Tel. (310) 442-9300 x 304
Fax. (310) 442-9330